Non-Minimal Flavored $\mathbf{S}_3 \otimes \mathbf{Z}_2$ Left-Right Symmetric Model

Juan Carlos Gómez-Izquierdo[1,2,3*]

[1] *Tecnologico de Monterrey, Campus Estado de Mexico, Atizapan de Zaragoza, Estado de Mexico, Apartado Postal 52926, Mexico.*
[2] *Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México 3000, D.F., México.*
[3] *Instituto de Física, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México 01000, D.F., México.*

arXiv:1701.01747v2 [hep-ph] 16 Jan 2017

Abstract

We propose a non minimal left-right symmetric model with Parity Symmetry where the fermion mixings arise as result of imposing an $\mathbf{S}_3 \otimes \mathbf{Z}_2$ flavor symmetry, and an extra $\mathbf{Z}_2^e$ symmetry is considered to suppress some Yukawa couplings in the lepton sector. As consequence, in the lepton sector, the effective neutrino mass matrix possesses approximately the $\mu-\tau$ symmetry. The breaking of $\mu-\tau$ symmetry induces sizable non zero θ_{13}, and the deviation of θ_{23} from 45° is strongly controlled by an ϵ free parameter and active neutrino masses. So that, we have constrained the allowed region for ϵ parameter and the unknown neutrino masses, and at the same time, an exploration on the extreme Majorana phases is done since these turn out being relevant to enhance or suppress the reactor and atmospheric angles. As a result, the normal hierarchy is ruled out since the reactor angle turns out too small, for any values of the Majorana phases. For the inverted and degenerate hierarchy, there is one combination for the extreme phases where the reactor and atmospheric angles may be compatible with their allowed values but the parameters space is tight for the former ordering.

*email: jcgizquierdo1979@gmail.com

1 Introduction

Currently, we know that neutrinos oscillate and have a tiny mass. In the theoretical framework of three active neutrinos, the difference of the squared neutrino masses for normal (inverted) hierarchy are given by $\Delta m^2_{21}\left(10^{-5}\,\mathrm{eV}^2\right) = 7.60^{+0.19}_{-0.18}$, and $|\Delta m^2_{31}|\left(10^{-3}\,\mathrm{eV}^2\right) = 2.48^{+0.05}_{-0.07}$ $(2.38^{+0.05}_{-0.06})$. Additionally, we have the values of the mixing angles $\sin^2\theta_{12}/10^{-1} = 3.23\pm0.16$, $\sin^2\theta_{23}/10^{-1} = 5.67^{+0.32}_{-1.24}$ $(5.73^{+0.25}_{-0.39})$ and $\sin^2\theta_{13}/10^{-2} = 2.26\pm0.12$ (2.29 ± 0.12) [1]. There is no yet solid evidence on the Dirac CP-violating phase.

A simplest route to include small neutrino masses and mixings to the Standard Model (SM) is to add the missing right-handed neutrinos (RHN's) states to the matter content, and then invoking the see-saw mechanism [2–8]. However, we should point out that the RHN mass scale is introduced by hand with no relation whatsoever to the Higgs mechanism that gives mass to all other fields. Nonetheless, this problem may be alleviated if the minimal extension of the SM is replaced by the left-right symmetric model (LRSM) [5, 9–12] where the RHN's are already included in the matter content. Additionally, the see-saw mechanism comes in rather naturally in the context of left-right symmetric scenarios; aside from other nice features, as for instance the recovery of Parity Symmetry, and the appearance of right-handed currents at high energy, which also makes such extensions very appealing. Recently, the left-right scenarios have been revised [13–21] in order to make contact with the last experimental data of LHC. Moreover, the dark matter problem [22, 23] and the diphoton excess anomaly [24–27] have been explored in this kind of scenarios.

Focusing in the peculiar neutrino mixing pattern (besides the CKM mixing matrix), the mass textures have played an important role in trying to solve this puzzle [28]. Actually, several discrete symmetries have been proposed [29–31] to get in an elegant way the mass textures. In this line of thought, the $\mathbf{S}_3$ flavor symmetry, in particular, is a good candidate to handle the Yukawa couplings for leptons and quarks; and this has been studied exhaustively in different frameworks [32–53]. In most of these works, the meaning of the flavor has been extended to the scalar sector such that three Higgs doublets are required to accommodate the PMNS and CKM mixing matrices.

Therefore, we propose a non-minimal LRSM with Parity Symmetry where the fermion mixings arise as result of imposing an $\mathbf{S}_3\otimes\mathbf{Z}_2$ flavor symmetry, and an extra $\mathbf{Z}_2^e$ symmetry is considered to suppress some Yukawa couplings in the lepton sector (see [54, 55] for flavored LRSM). Additionally, a non conventional assignment is done for the matter content under the $\mathbf{S}_3$ symmetry and this is the clear difference between the previous studies and this one. As consequence, in the lepton sector, the effective neutrino mass matrix possesses approximately the $\mu-\tau$ symmetry [56–69]. The breaking of the $\mu-\tau$ symmetry induces sizable non zero θ_{13}, and the deviation of θ_{23} from 45° is strongly controlled by an ϵ free parameter and active neutrino masses. So that, we have constrained the allowed region for ϵ parameter and the unknown neutrino masses, and at the same time, an exploration on the extreme Majorana phases is done since these turn out to be relevant to enhance or suppress the reactor and atmospheric angle. As results, the normal hierarchy is ruled out since the reactor angle comes out being tiny, for any values of the Majorana phases. For the inverted and degenerate hierarchy, there is one combination for the extreme phases where the reactor and atmospheric angles may be compatible with their allowed values but the parameter space is tight for the former ordering. The quark sector will be discussed exhaustively in a future work, however,

some preliminary results will be commented. The paper is organized as follows: we present, in Sec. II, the matter content of the model and also their respective assignment under the $\mathbf{S}_3$ symmetry. In addition, we briefly explain the scalar sector and argue about the need to include the $\mathbf{Z}_2^e$ symmetry. In Sec. III, the fermion mass matrices are obtained and we put attention on the lepton sector for getting the mixing matrices. We present, in Sec. IV, the PMNS matrix that the model predicts. Finally, we present an analytic study on the mixing angles and our results in Sec. V, and we close our discussion with a summary of conclusions.

2 Flavored Left-Right Symmetric Model

The left-right model we shall consider along our discussion is based on the usual, $SU(3)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes SU(2)_R \otimes U(1)_{B-L}$, gauge symmetry where Parity Symmetry, $\mathcal{P}$, is assumed to be a symmetry a high energy but it is broken at electroweak scale since there are no right-handed currents. The matter fields and their respective quantum numbers (in parenthesis) under the gauge symmetry are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_{(L,R)} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}_{(L,R)} \sim (3,(2,1),(1,2),1/3), \quad (L,R) = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ \ell \end{pmatrix}_{(L,R)} \sim (1,(2,1),(1,2),-1), \\
\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^0 & \phi'^+ \\ \phi^- & \phi'^0 \end{pmatrix} \sim (1,2,2,0)\,; \quad \Delta_{(L,R)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\delta^+}{2} & \delta^{++} \\ \delta^0 & -\frac{\delta^+}{2} \end{pmatrix}_{(L,R)} \sim (1,(3,1),(1,3),2)\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{1}
$$

On the other hand, the non-Abelian group $\mathbf{S}_3$ is the permutation group of three objects and this has three irreducible representations: two 1-dimensional, $\mathbf{1}_S$ and $\mathbf{1}_A$, and one 2-dimensional representation, $\mathbf{2}$ (for a detailed study see [29]). The multiplication rules among them are

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{1}_S \otimes \mathbf{1}_S = \mathbf{1}_S, \quad \mathbf{1}_S \otimes \mathbf{1}_A = \mathbf{1}_A, \quad \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_S = \mathbf{1}_A, \quad \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_A = \mathbf{1}_A, \\
&\mathbf{1}_S \otimes \mathbf{2} = \mathbf{2}, \quad \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \mathbf{2} = \mathbf{2}, \quad \mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{1}_S = \mathbf{2}, \quad \mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{1}_A = \mathbf{2}; \\
&\begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix}_{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix}_{\mathbf{2}} = (a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2)_{\mathbf{1}_S} \oplus (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1)_{\mathbf{1}_A} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_1 \\ a_1 b_1 - a_2 b_2 \end{pmatrix}_{\mathbf{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}
$$

Having commented briefly the gauge group and the non-Abelian group, then we will consider three Higgs bidoublets but three left-right triplets have been added with the purpose of getting mixings in the lepton sector. In addition, the quark and lepton families have been assigned in a different way under the irreducible representation of $\mathbf{S}_3$. Explicitly, for the former and the Higgs sector respectively, the first and second family have been put together in a flavor doublet $\mathbf{2}$, and the third family is a singlet $\mathbf{1}_S$. On the contrary, for the latter sector, the first family is a singlet $\mathbf{1}_S$ and the second and third families are put in a doublet $\mathbf{2}$. The advantage of making this choice is that the quark mass matrices may be put into two mass textures fashion that fit the CKM matrix very well; in the lepton sector the appearance of the approximated $\mu - \tau$ symmetry in the effective neutrino mass matrix helps to obtain good results for the mixings.

The matter content of the model transforms in a not trivial way under the $\mathbf{S}_3$ symmetry and this is displayed in the table below. Here, the $\mathbf{Z_2}$ symmetry has been added in order to prohibit some Yukawa couplings in the lepton sector. Thus, the most general Yukawa mass

Matter	$Q_{I(L,R)}$	$Q_{3(L,R)}$	(L_1, R_1)	(L_J, R_J)	Φ_I	Φ_3	$\Delta_{I(L,R)}$	$\Delta_{3(L,R)}$
S_3	2	1_S	1_S	2	2	1_S	2	1_S
Z_2	1	1	1	-1	1	1	-1	1

Table 1: Non-minimal left-right model. Here, $I = 1, 2$ and $J = 2, 3$.

term, that respects the $\mathbf{S}_3 \otimes \mathbf{Z}_2$ flavour symmetry and the gauge group, is given as

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_Y = {} & y_1^q \left[\bar{Q}_{1L}\left(\Phi_1 Q_{2R} + \Phi_2 Q_{1R}\right) + \bar{Q}_{2L}\left(\Phi_1 Q_{1R} - \Phi_2 Q_{2R}\right)\right] + y_2^q \left[\bar{Q}_{1L}\Phi_3 Q_{1R} + \bar{Q}_{2L}\Phi_3 Q_{2R}\right] + y_3^q \left[\bar{Q}_{1L}\Phi_1 + \bar{Q}_{2L}\Phi_2\right] Q_{3R} \\
& + y_4^q \bar{Q}_{3L}\left[\Phi_1 Q_{1R} + \Phi_2 Q_{2R}\right] + y_5^q \bar{Q}_{3L}\Phi_3 Q_{3R} + \tilde{y}_1^q \left[\bar{Q}_{1L}\left(\tilde{\Phi}_1 Q_{2R} + \tilde{\Phi}_2 Q_{1R}\right) + \bar{Q}_{2L}\left(\tilde{\Phi}_1 Q_{1R} - \tilde{\Phi}_2 Q_{2R}\right)\right] \\
& + \tilde{y}_2^q \left[\bar{Q}_{1L}\tilde{\Phi}_3 Q_{1R} + \bar{Q}_{2L}\tilde{\Phi}_3 Q_{2R}\right] + \tilde{y}_3^q \left[\bar{Q}_{1L}\tilde{\Phi}_1 + \bar{Q}_{2L}\tilde{\Phi}_2\right] Q_{3R} + \tilde{y}_4^q \bar{Q}_{3L}\left[\tilde{\Phi}_1 Q_{1R} + \tilde{\Phi}_2 Q_{2R}\right] + \tilde{y}_5^q \bar{Q}_{3L}\tilde{\Phi}_3 Q_{3R} + y_1^\ell \bar{L}_1 \Phi_3 R_1 \\
& + y_2^\ell \left[(\bar{L}_2\Phi_2 + \bar{L}_3\Phi_1)R_2 + (\bar{L}_2\Phi_1 - \bar{L}_3\Phi_2)R_3\right] + y_3^\ell \left[\bar{L}_2\Phi_3 R_2 + \bar{L}_3\Phi_3 R_3\right] + \tilde{y}_1^\ell \bar{L}_1 \tilde{\Phi}_3 R_1 \\
& + \tilde{y}_2^\ell \left[(\bar{L}_2\tilde{\Phi}_2 + \bar{L}_3\tilde{\Phi}_1)R_2 + (\bar{L}_2\tilde{\Phi}_1 - \bar{L}_3\tilde{\Phi}_2)R_3\right] + \tilde{y}_3^\ell \left[\bar{L}_2\tilde{\Phi}_3 R_2 + \bar{L}_3\tilde{\Phi}_3 R_3\right] + y_1^L \bar{L}_1 \Delta_{3L} L_1^c + y_2^L \bar{L}_1\left[\Delta_{1L} L_2^c + \Delta_{2L} L_3^c\right] \\
& + y_3^L \left[\bar{L}_2\Delta_{1L} + \bar{L}_3\Delta_{2L}\right] L_1^c + y_4^L \left[\bar{L}_2\Delta_{3L} L_2^c + \bar{L}_3\Delta_{3L} L_3^c\right] + y_1^R \bar{R}_1^c \Delta_{3R} R_1 + y_2^R \bar{R}_1^c \left[\Delta_{1R} R_2 + \Delta_{2R} R_3\right] \\
& + y_3^R \left[\bar{R}_2^c \Delta_{1R} + \bar{R}^c \Delta_{2R}\right] R_1 + y_4^R \left[\bar{R}_2^c \Delta_{3R} R_2 + \bar{R}_3^c \Delta_{3R} R_3\right] + h.c,
\end{aligned} \tag{3}
$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}_i = -i\sigma_2 \Phi_i^* i\sigma_2$. On the other hand, in here Parity Symmetry will be assumed in the above Lagrangian. This requires that $\Psi_{iL} \leftrightarrow \Psi_{iR}$, $\Phi_i \leftrightarrow \Phi_i^\dagger$ and $\Delta_{iL} \leftrightarrow \Delta_{iR}^\dagger$ for fermions and scalar fields, respectively. Thereby, the Yukawa couplings may reduce substantially and the gauge couplings too. In here, we stress that an extra symmetry $\mathbf{Z}_2^e$ is used to get a diagonal charged lepton and Dirac neutrino mass matrix whereas the Majorana mass matrices retain their forms. Explicitly, in the above Lagrangian, we demand that

$$
L_3 \leftrightarrow -L_3, \quad R_3 \leftrightarrow -R_3, \quad \Delta_{2L} \leftrightarrow -\Delta_{2L}, \quad \Delta_{2R} \leftrightarrow -\Delta_{2R}. \tag{4}
$$

so that some terms are absent in the lepton sector. On the other hand, in this kind of models the spontaneous symmetry breaking is as follows: Parity Symmetry is broken at the same scale where the Δ_R right-handed scale acquires its vacuum expectation value (vev). At the first stage, the RHN's are massive particles, then the rest of the particles turn out massive since the Higgs scalars get their vevs. Actually, the $\mathbf{S}_3$ flavor symmetry is broken by the Φ_i three scalar bidoublets whose vev's are given as

$$
\langle \Delta_{L,R} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ v_{L,R} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle \Phi_i \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} k_i & 0 \\ 0 & k_i' \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle \tilde{\Phi}_i \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} k_i'^* & 0 \\ 0 & k_i^* \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}
$$

We ought to comment that the scalar potential will not be analyzed for the moment, since we are interested in masses and mixings for fermions. However, this study has to be done eventually since is crucial for theoretical and phenomenological purpose.

The Yukawa mass term is given by

$$
-\mathcal{L}_Y = \bar{q}_{iL}\left(\mathbf{M}_q\right)_{ij} q_{jR} + \bar{\ell}_{iL}\left(\mathbf{M}_\ell\right)_{ij} \ell_{jR} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\nu}_{iL}\left(\mathbf{M}_\nu\right)_{ij} \nu_{jL}^c + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\nu}_{iR}^c \left(\mathbf{M}_R\right)_{ij} \nu_{jR} + h.c. \tag{6}
$$

where the type I see-saw mechanism has been realized, $\mathbf{M}_\nu = -\mathbf{M}_D \mathbf{M}_R^{-1} \mathbf{M}_D^T$; so that the $\mathbf{M}_L$ were neglected for simplicity. Therefore, the mass matrices can be read of Eq.(3) and have the following form

$$
\mathbf{M}_q = \begin{pmatrix} a_q + b_q' & b_q & c_q \\ b_q & a_q - b_q' & c_q' \\ f_q & f_q' & g_q \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M}_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} a_\ell & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_\ell + c_\ell & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_\ell - c_\ell \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M}_{(L,R)} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{(L,R)} & b_{(L,R)} & b'_{(L,R)} \\ b_{(L,R)} & c_{(L,R)} & 0 \\ b'_{(L,R)} & 0 & c_{(L,R)} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}
$$

where the $q = u, d$ and $\ell = e, \nu_D$. Explicitly, the matrix elements for quarks and lepton sector are given as

$$a_u = y_2^q k_3 + \tilde{y}_2^q k_3'^*, \quad b_u' = y_1^q k_2 + \tilde{y}_1^q k_2'^*, \quad b_u = y_1^q k_1 + \tilde{y}_1^q k_1'^*, \quad c_u = y_3^q k_1 + \tilde{y}_3^q k_1'^*, \, c_u' = y_3^q k_2 + \tilde{y}_3^q k_2'^*, \quad f_u = y_3^{\dagger q} k_1 + \tilde{y}_3^{\dagger q} k_1'^*,$$
$$f_u' = y_3^{\dagger q} k_2 + \tilde{y}_3^{\dagger q} k_2'^*, \quad g_u = y_5^q k_3 + \tilde{y}_5^q k_3'^*, \quad a_d = y_2^q k_3' + \tilde{y}_2^q k_3^*, \quad b_d' = y_1^q k_2' + \tilde{y}_1^q k_2^*, \quad b_d = y_1^q k_1' + \tilde{y}_1^q k_1^*, \quad c_d = y_3^q k_1' + \tilde{y}_3^q k_1^*;$$
$$c_d' = y_3^q k_2' + \tilde{y}_3^q k_2^*, \quad f_d = y_3^{\dagger q} k_1' + \tilde{y}_3^{\dagger q} k_1^*, \quad f_d' = y_3^{\dagger q} k_2' + \tilde{y}_3^{\dagger q} k_2^*, \quad g_u = y_5^q k_3' + \tilde{y}_5^q k_3^*, \quad a_D = y_1^\ell k_3 + \tilde{y}_1^\ell k_3'^*, \quad b_D = y_3^\ell k_3 + \tilde{y}_3 k_3'^*,$$
$$c_D = y_2^\ell k_2 + \tilde{y}_2 k_2'^*, \quad a_e = y_1^\ell k_3' + \tilde{y}_1^\ell k_3^*, \quad b_e = y_3^\ell k_3' + \tilde{y}_3 k_3^*, \quad c_e = y_2^\ell k_2' + \tilde{y}_2 k_2^*, \quad a_{(L,R)} = y_1^R v_{1(L,R)}, \quad b_{(L,R)} = y_2^R v_{2(L,R)}$$
$$b'_{(L,R)} = y_2^R v_{3(L,R)}, \quad c_{(L,R)} = y_4^R v_{1(L,R)}. \tag{8}$$

where Parity symmetry has been considered. Moreover, we will end up having a complex symmetric (diagonal) quark (lepton) mass matrix if the vev's are complex; in the literature this scenario is well known as **pseudomanifest left-right symmetry**. If the vev's are real, the quark (lepton) mass matrix is hermitian (real) and the number of CP phases are reduced, this framework is known as **manifest left-right symmetry**. In this work, we will discuss only the first framework and the second one will be studied in an extended version of the model and its consequences on the quark sector.

3 Masses and Mixings

In principle, in the mass matrices, we can reduce a further the number of free parameters considering certain alignment in the vev's, see Eq.(8). So that, for the moment, we will assume that the vev's of Φ_1 and Φ_2 are degenerate. Explicitly, we demand that $k_1 = k_2 \equiv k$ and $k_1' = k_2' \equiv k'$. Additionally, $v_{1R} = v_{2R} = v_R$. Therefore, we have:

Pseudomanisfest left-right theory.

$$\mathbf{M}_q = \begin{pmatrix} a_q + b_q & b_q & c_q \\ b_q & a_q - b_q & c_q \\ c_q & c_q & g_q \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M}_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} a_\ell & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_\ell + c_\ell & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_\ell - c_\ell \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M}_{(L,R)} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{(L,R)} & b_{(L,R)} & b_{(L,R)} \\ b_{(L,R)} & c_{(L,R)} & 0 \\ b_{(L,R)} & 0 & c_{(L,R)} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

Manifest left-right theory.

$$\mathbf{M}_q = \begin{pmatrix} a_q + b_q & b_q & c_q \\ b_q & a_q - b_q & c_q \\ c_q^* & c_q^* & g_q \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M}_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} a_\ell & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_\ell + c_\ell & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_\ell - c_\ell \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M}_{(L,R)} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{(L,R)} & b_{(L,R)} & b_{(L,R)} \\ b_{(L,R)} & c_{(L,R)} & 0 \\ b_{(L,R)} & 0 & c_{(L,R)} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}$$

As was already commented the full analysis of the quark masses and mixings will be left aside for this moment. However, we just make some comments. In the **pseudomanifest** framework, the $\mathbf{M}_q$ mass matrix may be put into two mass textures fashion that fit the CKM matrix very well. In similar way, the **manifest** framework is tackled. For this case, the quark mixing matrix has fewer free parameters than the above framework since this is hermitian; the study, and its predictions on the mixing angles is work in progress.

3.1 Lepton Sector

The $\mathbf{M}_e$ mass matrix is complex and diagonal then one could identify straight the physical masses, however, we will make a similarity transformation in order to prohibit a fine tuning in the free parameters. What we mean is the following, the $\mathbf{M}_e$ mass matrix is diagonalized

by $\mathbf{U}_{eL}=\mathbf{S}_{23}\mathbf{P}_e$ and $\mathbf{U}_{eR}=\mathbf{S}_{23}\mathbf{P}_e^{\dagger}$, this is, $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_e=\text{diag.}(|m_e|,|m_\mu|,|m_\tau|)=\mathbf{U}_{eL}^{\dagger}\mathbf{M}_e\mathbf{U}_{eR}=\mathbf{P}^{\dagger}\mathbf{m}_e\mathbf{P}_e^{\dagger}$ with $\mathbf{m}_e=\mathbf{S}_{23}^{T}\mathbf{M}_e\mathbf{S}_{23}$. After factorizing the phases, we have $\mathbf{m}_e=\mathbf{P}_e\bar{\mathbf{m}}_\mathbf{e}\mathbf{P}_e$ where

$$\mathbf{m}_e=\text{diag.}(m_e,m_\mu,m_\tau),\quad \mathbf{S}_{23}=\begin{pmatrix}1&0&0\\0&0&1\\0&1&0\end{pmatrix},\quad \mathbf{P}_e=\text{diag.}(e^{i\eta_e},e^{i\eta_\mu},e^{i\eta_\tau}) \tag{11}$$

As result, one obtains $|m_e|=|a_e|$, $|m_\mu|=|b_e-c_e|$ and $|m_\tau|=|b_e+c_e|$.

On the other hand, the $\mathbf{M}_\nu$ effective neutrino mass matrix is given as

$$\mathbf{M}_\nu=\begin{pmatrix}\mathcal{X}a_D^2&-a_D\mathcal{Y}(b_D+c_D)&-a_D\mathcal{Y}(b_D-c_D)\\-a_D\mathcal{Y}(b_D+c_D)&\mathcal{W}(b_D+c_D)^2&\mathcal{Z}(b_D^2-c_D^2)\\-a_D\mathcal{Y}(b_D-c_D)&\mathcal{Z}(b_D^2-c_D^2)&\mathcal{W}(b_D-c_D)^2\end{pmatrix}\quad\text{where}\quad \mathbf{M}_R^{-1}\equiv\begin{pmatrix}\mathcal{X}&-\mathcal{Y}&-\mathcal{Y}\\-\mathcal{Y}&\mathcal{W}&\mathcal{Z}\\-\mathcal{Y}&\mathcal{Z}&\mathcal{W}\end{pmatrix} \tag{12}$$

Now as hypothesis, we will assume that b_D is larger than c_D, in this way the effective mass matrix can be written as

$$\mathbf{M}_\nu\equiv\begin{pmatrix}A_\nu&-B_\nu(1+\epsilon)&-B_\nu(1-\epsilon)\\-B_\nu(1+\epsilon)&C_\nu(1+\epsilon)^2&D_\nu(1-\epsilon^2)\\-B_\nu(1-\epsilon)&D_\nu(1-\epsilon^2)&C_\nu(1-\epsilon)^2\end{pmatrix} \tag{13}$$

where $A_\nu\equiv\mathcal{X}a_D^2$, $B_\nu\equiv\mathcal{Y}a_Db_D$, $C_\nu\equiv\mathcal{W}b_D^2$ and $D_\nu\equiv\mathcal{Z}b_D^2$ are complex. Besides, $\epsilon\equiv c_D/b_D$ is complex too. Here, we want to stress that the last parameter will be considered as a perturbation to the effective mass matrix such that $|\epsilon|\lll 1$. To be more specific, $0\leq|\epsilon|\leq 0.3$ in order to break softly the $\mu-\tau$ symmetry. So that, hereafter, we will neglect the ϵ^2 quadratic terms in the above matrix. Having done this, we go back to the effective neutrino mass matrix. In order to cancel the $\mathbf{S}_{23}$ contribution that comes from the charged lepton sector, we make the following to $\mathbf{M}_\nu$. We know that $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_\nu=\text{diag.}(m_{\nu_1},m_{\nu_2},m_{\nu_3})=\mathbf{U}_\nu^{\dagger}\mathbf{M}_\nu\mathbf{U}_\nu^{*}$, then $\mathbf{U}_\nu=\mathbf{S}_{23}\mathcal{U}_\nu$ where the latter mixing matrix will be obtained below. Then, $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_\nu=\mathcal{U}_\nu^{\dagger}\mathcal{M}_\nu\mathcal{U}_\nu^{*}$ with

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu\approx\begin{pmatrix}A_\nu&-B_\nu(1-\epsilon)&-B_\nu(1+\epsilon)\\-B_\nu(1-\epsilon)&C_\nu(1-2\epsilon)&D_\nu\\-B_\nu(1+\epsilon)&D_\nu&C_\nu(1+2\epsilon)\end{pmatrix} \tag{14}$$

When the ϵ parameter is switched off, the effective mass matrix, which is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_\nu^{\mathbf{0}}$, possesses the $\mu-\tau$ symmetry and this is diagonalized by

$$\mathcal{U}_\nu^0=\begin{pmatrix}\cos\theta_\nu\ e^{i(\eta_\nu+\pi)}&\sin\theta_\nu\ e^{i(\eta_\nu+\pi)}&0\\-\frac{\sin\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{2}}&\frac{\cos\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{2}}&-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\\-\frac{\sin\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{2}}&\frac{\cos\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{2}}&\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\end{pmatrix} \tag{15}$$

where the $\mathcal{M}_\nu^{\mathbf{0}}$ matrix elements are fixed in terms of the complex neutrinos physical masses, the θ_ν free parameter and the η_ν Dirac CP phase. To be more explicit,

$$\begin{aligned}&A_\nu=(m_{\nu_1}^0\cos^2\theta_\nu+m_{\nu_2}^0\sin^2\theta_\nu)e^{2i(\eta_\nu+\pi)},\quad \sqrt{2}B_\nu=-\cos\theta_\nu\sin\theta_\nu(m_{\nu_2}^0-m_{\nu_1}^0)e^{i(\eta_\nu+\pi)};\\&C_\nu=\frac{1}{2}(m_{\nu_1}^0\sin^2\theta_\nu+m_{\nu_2}^0\cos^2\theta_\nu+m_{\nu_3}^0),\quad D_\nu=\frac{1}{2}(m_{\nu_1}^0\sin^2\theta_\nu+m_{\nu_2}^0\cos^2\theta_\nu-m_{\nu_3}^0).\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Including the ϵ parameter we can write the effective mass matrix as $\mathcal{M}_\nu=\mathcal{M}_\nu^{\mathbf{0}}+\mathcal{M}_\nu^{\epsilon}$; the second matrix contains the perturbation, then, when we apply $\mathcal{U}_\nu^{\mathbf{0}}$ one gets $\mathcal{M}_\nu=\mathcal{U}_\nu^{\mathbf{0}\dagger}(\mathcal{M}_\nu^{\mathbf{0}}+\mathcal{M}_\nu^{\epsilon})\mathcal{U}_\nu^{\mathbf{0}*}$. Explicitly

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu=\text{Diag.}(m_{\nu_1}^0,m_{\nu_2}^0,m_{\nu_3}^0)+\begin{pmatrix}0&&-\sin\theta_\nu(m_{\nu_3}^0+m_{\nu_1}^0)\epsilon\\0&0&\cos\theta_\nu(m_{\nu_3}^0+m_{\nu_2}^0)\epsilon\\-\sin\theta_\nu(m_{\nu_3}^0+m_{\nu_1}^0)\epsilon&\cos\theta_\nu(m_{\nu_3}^0+m_{\nu_2}^0)\epsilon&0\end{pmatrix} \tag{17}$$

The contribution of second matrix to the mixing one is given by

$$\mathcal{U}_{\nu}^{\epsilon} \approx \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & 0 & -N_3 \sin\theta r_1\epsilon \\ 0 & N_2 & N_3 \cos\theta_\nu r_2\epsilon \\ N_1 \sin\theta_\nu r_1\epsilon & -N_2\cos\theta_\nu r_2\epsilon & N_3 \end{pmatrix} \tag{18}$$

where we have defined the complex mass ratios $r_{(1,2)} \equiv (m^0_{\nu_3} + m^0_{\nu_{(1,2)}})/(m^0_{\nu_3} - m^0_{\nu_{(1,2)}})$. Besides, N_1, N_2 and N_3 are the normalization factors which are given as

$$N_1 = \left(1+\sin^2\theta_\nu |r_1\epsilon|^2\right)^{-1/2}, \quad N_2 = \left(1+\cos^2\theta_\nu |r_2\epsilon|^2\right)^{-1/2}, \quad N_3 = \left(1+\sin^2\theta_\nu|r_1\epsilon|^2 + \cos^2\theta_\nu|r_2\epsilon|^2\right)^{-1/2}. \tag{19}$$

Finally, the effective mass matrix given in Eq.(13) is diagonalized approximately by $\mathbf{U}_\nu \approx \mathbf{S}_{23}\mathcal{U}^0_\nu\mathcal{U}^\epsilon_\nu$. Therefore, the theoretical PMNS mixing matrix is written as $V_{PMNS} = \mathbf{U}^\dagger_{eL}\mathbf{U}_\nu = \mathbf{P}^\dagger_e\mathcal{U}^0_\nu\mathcal{U}^\epsilon_\nu$.

4 PMNS Mixing Matrix

The PMNS mixing matrix is given explicitly as

$$\mathbf{V}_{PMNS} = \mathbf{P}^\dagger_e \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_\nu N_1 e^{i(\eta_\nu+\pi)} & \sin\theta_\nu N_2 e^{i(\eta_\nu+\pi)} & \sin 2\theta_\nu \frac{N_3}{2}(r_2-r_1)\epsilon e^{i(\eta_\nu+\pi)} \\ -\frac{\sin\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{2}} N_1(1+r_1\epsilon) & \frac{\cos\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{2}} N_2(1+r_2\epsilon) & -\frac{N_3}{\sqrt{2}}\left[1-\epsilon\, r_3\right] \\ -\frac{\sin\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{2}} N_1(1-r_1\epsilon) & \frac{\cos\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{2}} N_2(1-r_2\epsilon) & \frac{N_3}{\sqrt{2}}\left[1+\epsilon\, r_3\right] \end{pmatrix} \tag{20}$$

where $r_3 \equiv r_2\cos^2\theta_\nu + r_1\sin^2\theta_\nu$. On the other hand, comparing the magnitude of entries $\mathbf{V}_{PMNS}$ with the mixing matrix in the standard parametrization of the PMNS, we obtain the following expressions for the lepton mixing angles

$$\begin{aligned} &\sin^2\theta_{13} = |\mathbf{V}_{13}|^2 = \frac{\sin^2 2\theta_\nu}{4} N_3^2|\epsilon|^2\ |r_2-r_1|^2, \quad \sin^2\theta_{23} = \frac{|\mathbf{V}_{23}|^2}{1-|\mathbf{V}_{13}|^2} = \frac{N_3^2}{2}\frac{|1-\epsilon\, r_3|^2}{1-\sin^2\theta_{13}}, \\ &\sin^2\theta_{12} = \frac{|\mathbf{V}_{12}|^2}{1-|\mathbf{V}_{13}|^2} = \frac{N_2^2\sin^2\theta_\nu}{1-\sin^2\theta_{13}}. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We have to point out that the reactor and atmospheric angles depend strongly on the active neutrino masses ratios. At the same time, the reactor angle does not depend on the phase of the parameter ϵ, but on the other hand, the atmospheric one has a clear dependency on this phase.

5 Analytic Study and Results

In order to make an analytic study on the above formulas, let us emphasize that we are working in a perturbative regime which means that $0 \leq |\epsilon| \leq 0.3$. Then N_i normalization factors should be the order of 1 so that, as is usual in models where the $\mu-\tau$ symmetry is broken softly, the solar angle is directly related to the free parameter θ_ν, as can be seen in Eq. (21). Therefore, at the leading order we have that

$$\sin^2\theta_{12} = \sin^2\theta_\nu, \qquad \text{then,} \qquad \theta_{12} = \theta_\nu. \tag{22}$$

Additionally, we will analyze the extreme Majorana phases for the complex neutrino masses for each hierarchy. What we mean by extreme phases is that these can be either 0 or π.

Explicitly, $m^0_{\nu_i} = \pm|m^0_{\nu_i}|$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, where $|m^0_{\nu_i}|$ is the absolute mass. As we will see, these phases can be relevant to enhance or suppress the reactor and atmospheric angles. Depending of the spectrum hierarchy there is one neutrino mass which is undetermined so that this will be constrained.

Normal hierarchy. From experimental data, the absolute neutrino masses are $|m^0_{\nu_3}| = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{31} + |m^0_{\nu_1}|^2}$ and $|m^0_{\nu_2}| = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{21} + |m^0_{\nu_1}|^2}$. Now, the mass ratios r_1, r_2 and r_3 can be approximated as follows

$$r_1 \approx 1 + 2\frac{m^0_{\nu_1}}{m^0_{\nu_3}} \approx 1, \qquad r_2 \approx 1 + 2\frac{m^0_{\nu_2}}{m^0_{\nu_3}}, \qquad r_3 \approx 1 + 2\frac{m^0_{\nu_2}}{m^0_{\nu_3}}\cos^2\theta_\nu \tag{23}$$

as results of this, we obtain

$$\sin^2\theta_{13} \approx \sin^2 2\theta_\nu |\epsilon|^2 \left(\frac{m^0_{\nu_2}}{m^0_{\nu_3}}\right)^2, \quad \sin^2\theta_{23} \approx \frac{1}{2}\frac{|1 - \epsilon\left(1 + 2(m^0_{\nu_2}/m^0_{\nu_3})\right)\cos^2\theta_\nu)|^2}{1 - \sin^2\theta_{13}}. \tag{24}$$

As can be noticed, if the strict normal hierarchy is assumed then the reactor angle comes out being very small since $m^0_{\nu_2}/m^0_{\nu_3} \approx \Delta m^2_{21}/\Delta m^2_{31}$, and $|\epsilon| \lll 1$. This holds for any extreme Majorana phases in the neutrino masses and this result does not change substantially if the $m^0_{\nu_1}$ is non-zero. Therefore, the normal spectrum is ruled out for $0 \leq |\epsilon| \leq 0.3$.

Inverted hierarchy. In this case, we have that $|m^0_{\nu_2}| = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{13} + \Delta m^2_{21} + |m^0_{\nu_3}|^2}$ and $|m^0_{\nu_1}| = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{13} + |m^0_{\nu_3}|^2}$. The mass ratios r_1, r_2 and r_3 are written approximately as

$$r_{(1,2)} \approx -\left(1 + 2\frac{m^0_{\nu_3}}{m^0_{\nu_{(1,2)}}}\right), \quad r_2 - r_1 \approx 2m^0_{\nu_3}\left[\frac{m^0_{\nu_2} - m^0_{\nu_1}}{m^0_{\nu_2}m^0_{\nu_1}}\right], \quad r_3 \approx -\left[1 + 2\frac{m^0_{\nu_3}\left(m^0_{\nu_1}\cos^2\theta_\nu + m_{\nu_2}\sin^2\theta_\nu\right)}{m^0_{\nu_2}m^0_{\nu_1}}\right] \tag{25}$$

Due to the mass difference $m^0_{\nu_2} - m^0_{\nu_1}$ in the factor $r_2 - r_1$, the reactor angle can be small or large since the relative signs in these two masses may conspire to achieve it. There are four independent cases where the signs in the masses can affect substantially the mixing angles:

- **Case A**. If $m_{\nu_i} > 0$.

$$r_2 - r_1 \approx 2|m^0_{\nu_3}|\left[\frac{|m^0_{\nu_2}| - |m^0_{\nu_1}|}{|m^0_{\nu_2}||m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right], \quad r_3 \approx -\left[1 + 2\frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|\left(|m^0_{\nu_2}|\sin^2\theta_\nu + |m_{\nu_1}|\cos^2\theta_\nu\right)}{|m^0_{\nu_2}||m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right] \tag{26}$$

- **Case B**. If $m^0_{\nu_{(2,1)}} > 0$ and $m^0_{\nu_3} < 0$.

$$r_2 - r_1 \approx -2|m^0_{\nu_3}|\left[\frac{|m^0_{\nu_2}| - |m^0_{\nu_1}|}{|m^0_{\nu_2}||m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right], \quad r_3 \approx -\left[1 - 2\frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|\left(|m^0_{\nu_2}|\sin^2\theta_\nu + |m_{\nu_1}|\cos^2\theta_\nu\right)}{|m^0_{\nu_2}||m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right] \tag{27}$$

- **Case C**. If If $m^0_{\nu_{(3,2)}} > 0$ and $m^0_{\nu_1} < 0$.

$$r_2 - r_1 \approx -2|m^0_{\nu_3}|\left[\frac{|m^0_{\nu_2}| + |m^0_{\nu_1}|}{|m^0_{\nu_2}||m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right], \quad r_3 \approx -\left[1 - 2\frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|\left(|m_{\nu_2}|\sin^2\theta_\nu - |m^0_{\nu_1}|\cos^2\theta_\nu\right)}{|m^0_{\nu_2}||m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right] \tag{28}$$

- **Case D**. If $m^0_{\nu_2} >$ and $m^0_{\nu_{(3,1)}} < 0$.

$$r_2 - r_1 \approx 2|m^0_{\nu_3}|\left[\frac{|m^0_{\nu_2}| + |m^0_{\nu_1}|}{|m^0_{\nu_2}||m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right], \quad r_3 \approx -\left[1 + 2\frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|\left(|m_{\nu_2}|\sin^2\theta_\nu - |m^0_{\nu_1}|\cos^2\theta_\nu\right)}{|m^0_{\nu_2}||m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right] \tag{29}$$

Noticing, if the strict inverted hierarchy were realized, $r_2 - r_1 = 0$ and $r_3 = -1$, we would have that $\sin^2\theta_{13} = 0$ and $\sin^2\theta_{23} = N_3^2|1+\epsilon|^2/2$, which is not compatible with the observations. Nonetheless, this strict ordering allows us to infer that the $|\epsilon|e^{i\alpha_\epsilon}$ parameter magnitude has to be small in order to deviate sufficiently the atmospheric angle from 45°; and the associated phase determines if we are above or below of 45°. On the contrary, if the constraint, on the lightest neutrino mass, is relaxed, the reactor angle comes out being non zero; and the atmospheric one has an extra contribution, r_3, which can enlarge or reduce the $|\epsilon|$ magnitude since this may be greater or minor than 1. So that, the factor $|\epsilon\, r_3|$ might deviate drastically the atmospheric angle beyond of 45°. Roughly speaking, the reactor angle turns out being equal for the **Cases A** and **B**, and also, for **C** and **D**. The key difference among them comes from the atmospheric angle as can be seen in Eq.(26-29).

On the other hand, we observe that

$$|m^0_{\nu_2}| - |m^0_{\nu_1}| \approx 2|m^0_{\nu_1}|R_1, \quad |m^0_{\nu_2}| + |m^0_{\nu_1}| \approx 2|m^0_{\nu_1}|\,[1+R_1]\,, \quad |m^0_{\nu_1}||m^0_{\nu_2}| \approx |m^0_{\nu_1}|^2\,[1+2R_1]\,, \tag{30}$$

where, $R_1 \equiv \Delta m^2_{21}/4|m^0_{\nu_1}|^2 \approx \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$, if the $|m^0_{\nu_3}|$ lightest neutrino mass is tiny. Therefore, we can conclude that the first two scenarios are ruled out since the reactor angle is proportional to the small quantity $(|m^0_{\nu_3}|R_1/|m^0_{\nu_1}|)\epsilon$, where $|\epsilon| \lll 1$. For the **Case C** (**Case D**) the corresponding sign is the upper (lower), then the mixing angles are given as

$$\sin^2\theta_{13} \approx 4\sin^2 2\theta_\nu|\epsilon|^2\left(\frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|}{|m^0_{\nu_1}|}\right)^2(1-R_1)^2, \quad \sin^2\theta_{23} \approx \frac{1}{2}\frac{|1+\epsilon\left[1\pm 2(|m^0_{\nu_3}|/|m^0_{\nu_1}|)\cos 2\theta_\nu\right]|^2}{1-\sin^2\theta_{13}}. \tag{31}$$

From these formulas, in general, an $|\epsilon|$ large value will be needed to compensate the $|m^0_{\nu_3}|$ lightest neutrino mass to get the allowed region for the reactor angle. But, the atmospheric angle prefers an $|\epsilon|$ small values so that the complex parameter phase is taken to be $\alpha_\epsilon = 0$ in order to increase this angle for reaching its central value. In order to fix ideas, with $\sin\theta_\nu \approx 1/\sqrt{3}$, which is approximately correct to the solar angle, we obtain for the **Case C**: (a) if $|\epsilon| \approx 0.3$, it is required that $|m^0_{\nu_3}|/|m^0_{\nu_1}| \approx 0.26$, to obtain $\sin^2\theta_{13} \approx 0.0229$. As consequence, we get $\sin^2\theta_{23} \approx 0.92$ which is too large; (b) if $|\epsilon| \approx 0.1$, then we need that $|m^0_{\nu_3}|/|m^0_{\nu_1}| \approx 0.8$ to get $\sin^2\theta_{13} \approx 0.0229$, and therefore, $\sin^2\theta_{23} \approx 0.62$, which is still large in comparison to the central value. Here, the latter mass ratio could be wrong for the inverted hierarchy since this implies that $|m^0_{\nu_3}| \sim |m^0_{\nu_1}|$. Now, in figure 1 the parameter space is shown where we have considered the exact formulas given in Eq. (21), the central values for the θ_{12} solar angle, Δm^2_{21} and Δm^2_{13}. As can be seen, this case is tight since there is no common region for the parameter space.

For **Case D**, with $\sin\theta_\nu \approx 1/\sqrt{3}$, the reactor angle has approximately the same values for $|\epsilon| \approx 0.3$, $|\epsilon| \approx 0.1$ and their respective $|m^0_{\nu_3}|/|m^0_{\nu_1}|$ mass ratios as above case. Taking the former and latter values of $|\epsilon|$, we obtain $\sin^2\theta_{23} \approx 0.78$ and $\sin^2\theta_{23} \approx 0.55$, respectively. Both values are approaching the allowed data, then, this case seems to be favored since a large contribution of $|\epsilon|$ is suppressed by r_3 which is minor than 1 and the reactor angle prefers an $|\epsilon|$ large values. In figure 2, one can see that there is a small region in the parameter space where the reactor and atmospheric angles can be accommodated. In this plot, as in the figure 1, we have considered the exact expressions for the mixing angles and the same values for the observables. Figures 1 and 2 confirm our theoretical predictions on the mixing angles, the atmospheric angle prefers small values for $|\epsilon|$ whereas the reactor one needs a large value.

Degenerated hierarchy. In this case, $|m^0_{\nu_3}| \cong |m^0_{\nu_2}| \cong |m^0_{\nu_1}| \cong m_0$, with $m_0 \gtrsim 0.1\ eV$. Then, the absolute neutrino masses can be written as $|m^0_{\nu_3}| = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{31} + m_0^2} \approx$



Figure 1: **Case C**: Allowed region for $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ and $\sin^2\theta_{23}$, respectively. The dash and thick lines stand for 1 σ and 3 σ for each case



Figure 2: **Case D**: Allowed region for $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ and $\sin^2\theta_{23}$. The dash and thick lines stand for 1 σ and 3 σ for each case

$m_0\,(1+\Delta m^2_{31}/2m_0^2)$ and $|m^0_{\nu_2}| = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{21}+m_0^2} \approx m_0\,(1+\Delta m^2_{21}/2m_0^2)$. As in the inverted case, there are four independent cases for the signs which are shown below.

- **Case A**. If $m^0_{\nu_i} > 0$,

$$r_1^A = \frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|+m_0}{|m^0_{\nu_3}|-m_0}, \qquad r_2^A = \frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|+|m^0_{\nu_2}|}{|m^0_{\nu_3}|-|m^0_{\nu_2}|}, \qquad r_3^A = r_2^A\cos^2\theta_\nu + r_1^A\sin^2\theta_\nu. \tag{32}$$

- **Case B**. If If $m^0_{\nu_{(2,1)}} > 0$ and $m^0_{\nu_3} < 0$,

$$r_1^B = \frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|-m_0}{|m^0_{\nu_3}|+m_0} = \frac{1}{r_1^A}, \qquad r_2^B = \frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|-|m^0_{\nu_2}|}{|m^0_{\nu_3}|+|m^0_{\nu_2}|} = \frac{1}{r_2^A}, \qquad r_3^B = r_2^B\cos^2\theta_\nu + r_1^B\sin^2\theta_\nu. \tag{33}$$

- **Case C**. If $m^0_{\nu_{(3,2)}} > 0$ and $m^0_{\nu_1} = -m_0$,

$$r_1^C = \frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|-m_0}{|m^0_{\nu_3}|+m_0} = \frac{1}{r_1^A}, \qquad r_2^C = \frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}|+|m^0_{\nu_2}|}{|m^0_{\nu_3}|-|m^0_{\nu_2}|} = r_2^A, \qquad r_3^C = r_2^C\cos^2\theta_\nu + r_1^C\sin^2\theta_\nu. \tag{34}$$

- **Case D**. If $m^0_{\nu_2} > 0$ and $m^0_{\nu_{(3,1)}} < 0$,

$$r^D_1 = \frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}| + m_0}{|m^0_{\nu_3}| - m_0} = r^A_1, \qquad r^D_2 = \frac{|m^0_{\nu_3}| - |m^0_{\nu_2}|}{|m^0_{\nu_3}| + |m^0_{\nu_2}|} = \frac{1}{r^A_2}, \qquad r^D_3 = r^D_2 \cos^2\theta_\nu + r^D_1 \sin^2\theta_\nu. \tag{35}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &|m^0_{\nu_3}| - m_0 \approx 2m_0 R_2, \quad |m^0_{\nu_3}| + m_0 \approx 2m_0\,(1+R_2)\,, \\ &|m^0_{\nu_3}| - |m^0_{\nu_2}| \approx 2m_0 R_2\,(1-R_3)\,, \quad |m^0_{\nu_3}| + |m^0_{\nu_2}| \approx 2m_0\,[1+R_2+R_4]\,, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

with $R_2 \equiv \Delta m^2_{31}/4m^2_0$, $R_3 = \Delta m^2_{21}/\Delta m^2_{31}$ and $R_4 = \Delta m^2_{21}/4m^2_0$, where $R_4 < R_3 \lesssim R_2$. Thus, $r^A_1 \approx (1+R_2)/R_2$ and $r^A_2 \approx r^A_1(1+R_3)$. Fixing ideas on the order of magnitude of each defined quantity, we use the data for the inverted hierarchy and their respective central values. So that, $R_2 \sim 6\times10^{-2}$, $R_3 \sim 3\times10^{-2}$, $R_4 \sim 2\times10^{-3}$ and $r^A_1 \sim 17$ with $m_0 = 0.1\ eV$. This implies that **Cases A** and **B** are ruled out since the reactor angle turns out being small due to $r^A_2 - r^A_1 \approx r^A_1 R_3$ and $r^B_2 - r^B_1 \approx -R_3/r^A_1$ which are tiny. The only feasible cases are **C** and **D**. In the **Case C**, we have that $r^C_2 - r^C_1 \approx r^A_1$ and $r^C_3 \approx r^A_1 \cos^2\theta_\nu$, so that

$$\sin^2\theta_{13} \approx \frac{\sin^2 2\theta_\nu}{4}|\epsilon|^2(r^A_1(1+R_3))^2, \qquad \sin^2\theta_{23} \approx \frac{1}{2}\frac{|1 - r^A_1\cos^2\theta_\nu\epsilon|^2}{1-\sin^2\theta_{13}}. \tag{37}$$

For the **Case D**, $r^D_2 - r^D_1 \approx -r^A_1$ and $r^D_3 \approx r^A_1 \sin^2\theta_\nu$. Thus,



Figure 3: **Case C**: Allowed region for $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ and $\sin^2\theta_{23}$. The dash and thick lines stand for 1 σ and 3 σ for each case

$$\sin^2\theta_{13} \approx \frac{\sin^2 2\theta_\nu}{4}|\epsilon|^2(r^A_1)^2, \qquad \sin^2\theta_{23} \approx \frac{1}{2}\frac{|1 - r^A_1\epsilon\sin^2\theta_\nu|^2}{1-\sin^2\theta_{13}}. \tag{38}$$

As in the inverted cases, the reactor angle has approximately the same behavior for both cases and they can be only distinguished by the atmospheric angle. In this way, notice that $r_3 > 0$ for both cases then if $\alpha_\epsilon = 0$, the atmospheric angle would be smaller than 45° which is far away from the experimental data. In order to increase this value, it is needed that $\alpha_\epsilon = \pi$. Therefore, the atmospheric angle might reach its experimental value. Additionally, because of $r^A_1 \ggg 1$, $|\epsilon|$ should be of the order of 10^{-2} in order to not enhance too much the atmospheric angle, of course, we must be careful to not spoil the reactor angle or vice versa.



Figure 4: **Case D**: Allowed region for $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ and $\sin^2\theta_{23}$. The dash and thick lines stand for 1 σ and 3 σ for each case

For both cases, $\sin\theta_\nu \approx 1/\sqrt{3}$, then it is required that $|\epsilon| \sim 2\times 10^{-2}$ in order to get $\sin^2\theta_{13} \approx 0.028$, besides $\sin^2\theta_{23} \approx 0.7$ and $\sin^2\theta_{23} \approx 0.61$ in the case **C** and **D**, respectively. Now, if m_0 is increased to the allowed value $0.4\ eV$, then r_1^A becomes quite large and therefore, a tiny $|\epsilon|$ is needed to not deviate so much from 45° the atmospheric angle; and at the same time, to get an allowed region for the reactor angle. In figures 3 and 4, the exact formulas for the mixing angles have been used, apart from the central values for Δm^2_{21}, Δm^2_{13} and θ_ν the solar angle to show the parameter space. Then, there is a large region where both angles of interest are accommodated very well, as can be seen in the figures. Therefore, the degenerate ordering is favored instead of the inverted case.

6 Conclusions

We have extended the scalar sector of LRSM in order to get masses and mixings for fermions. The Yukawa sector is handled by the $\mathbf{S}_3\otimes\mathbf{Z}_2$ symmetry at the Lagrangian level, and an extra $\mathbf{Z}_2^e$ symmetry is considered to suppress some Yukawa couplings in the lepton sector.

Although the model is quite elaborated, it is fairly predictive. In the lepton sector, we have studied neutrino masses and mixings in the limit of a slightly broken $\mu-\tau$ symmetry. Analytic expressions for the reactor and atmospheric angles were obtained and fixed in terms of one free parameter of the model, ϵ, and the active neutrino mass ratios. Due to the strong dependency on the active neutrino masses, those mixing angles are sensitive to the extreme Majorana phases which may increase or decrease their respective values. Therefore, as a result the model predicts a tiny value for the reactor angle for normal hierarchy and this result holds for whatever signs the Majorana phases have. Thus, the normal ordering is completely ruled out for $0 \leq |\epsilon| \leq 0.3$. In the inverted and degenerate hierarchies, there two combinations in the extreme Majorana phases where the reactor and atmospheric angles might be within the experimental data. Of course, some cases are favored over others so that the former hierarchy is so constrained that the latter one seems to be the best consistent framework compatible with the experimental data. In those cases, a set of values for ϵ and the lightest active neutrino mass were found which are consistent with current limits imposed by the experimental data for $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ and $\sin^2\theta_{13}$. For the moment, the quark sector has been

left aside for a future work but we have pointed out that the mass matrices possess textures that might fit the CKM matrix.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Myriam Mondragón and Abdel Pérez-Lorenzana for their useful comments on the manuscript. This work was partially supported by a PAPIIT grant IN111115. The author thanks Red de Altas Energías-CONACYT for the financial support.

References

[1] D. V. Forero, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle. Neutrino oscillations refitted. *Phys. Rev.*, D90(9):093006, 2014.

[2] Peter Minkowski. mu $\rightarrow$ e gamma at a Rate of One Out of 1-Billion Muon Decays? *Phys. Lett.*, B67:421, 1977.

[3] Murray Gell-Mann, Pierre Ramond, and Richard Slansky. Complex Spinors and Unified Theories. *Conf.Proc.*, C790927:315–321, 1979.

[4] Tsutomu Yanagida. Horizontal gauge symmetry and masses of neutrinos. In Proceedings of the Workshop on the Baryon Number of the Universe and Unified Theories, Tsukuba, Japan, 13-14 Feb 1979.

[5] Rabindra N. Mohapatra and Goran Senjanovic. Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Violation. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 44:912, 1980.

[6] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle. Neutrino Masses in SU(2) x U(1) Theories. *Phys. Rev.*, D22:2227, 1980.

[7] Rabindra N. Mohapatra and Goran Senjanovic. Neutrino Masses and Mixings in Gauge Models with Spontaneous Parity Violation. *Phys. Rev.*, D23:165, 1981.

[8] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle. Neutrino Decay and Spontaneous Violation of Lepton Number. *Phys. Rev.*, D25:774, 1982.

[9] Jogesh C. Pati and Abdus Salam. Lepton Number as the Fourth Color. *Phys. Rev.*, D10:275–289, 1974. [Erratum: Phys. Rev.D11,703(1975)].

[10] R. N. Mohapatra and Jogesh C. Pati. A Natural Left-Right Symmetry. *Phys. Rev.*, D11:2558, 1975.

[11] G. Senjanovic and Rabindra N. Mohapatra. Exact Left-Right Symmetry and Spontaneous Violation of Parity. *Phys. Rev.*, D12:1502, 1975.

[12] Goran Senjanovic. Spontaneous Breakdown of Parity in a Class of Gauge Theories. *Nucl. Phys.*, B153:334–364, 1979.

[13] Goran Senjanovi? and Vladimir Tello. Right Handed Quark Mixing in Left-Right Symmetric Theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 114(7):071801, 2015.

[14] J. Chakrabortty, J. Gluza, T. Jelinski, and T. Srivastava. Theoretical constraints on masses of heavy particles in Left-Right Symmetric Models. *Phys. Lett.*, B759:361–368, 2016.

[15] P. S. Bhupal Dev, Rabindra N. Mohapatra, and Yongchao Zhang. Probing the Higgs Sector of the Minimal Left-Right Symmetric Model at Future Hadron Colliders. *JHEP*, 05:174, 2016.

[16] Manimala Mitra, Richard Ruiz, Darren J. Scott, and Michael Spannowsky. Neutrino Jets from High-Mass W_R Gauge Bosons in TeV-Scale Left-Right Symmetric Models. 2016.

[17] Goran Senjanovic. Is Left-Right Symmetry the Key? In *Memorial Meeting for Nobel Laureate Professor Abdus Salam's 90th Birthday Singapore, Singapore, January 25-28, 2016*, 2016.

[18] Goran Senjanovi? and Vladimir Tello. Restoration of Parity and the Right-Handed Analog of the CKM Matrix. *Phys. Rev.*, D94(9):095023, 2016.

[19] Manfred Lindner, Farinaldo S. Queiroz, and Werner Rodejohann. Dilepton bounds on left?right symmetry at the LHC run II and neutrinoless double beta decay. *Phys. Lett.*, B762:190–195, 2016.

[20] Sudhanwa Patra, Farinaldo S. Queiroz, and Werner Rodejohann. Stringent Dilepton Bounds on Left-Right Models using LHC data. *Phys. Lett.*, B752:186–190, 2016.

[21] Manfred Lindner, Moritz Platscher, and Farinaldo S. Queiroz. A Call for New Physics : The Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment and Lepton Flavor Violation. 2016.

[22] Asher Berlin, Patrick J. Fox, Dan Hooper, and Gopolang Mohlabeng. Mixed Dark Matter in Left-Right Symmetric Models. *JCAP*, 1606(06):016, 2016.

[23] Sudhanwa Patra and Soumya Rao. Singlet fermion Dark Matter within Left-Right Model. *Phys. Lett.*, B759:454–458, 2016.

[24] Chandan Hati. Explaining the diphoton excess in Alternative Left-Right Symmetric Model. *Phys. Rev.*, D93(7):075002, 2016.

[25] Frank F. Deppisch, Chandan Hati, Sudhanwa Patra, Prativa Pritimita, and Utpal Sarkar. Implications of the diphoton excess on left?right models and gauge unification. *Phys. Lett.*, B757:223–230, 2016.

[26] Ujjal Kumar Dey, Subhendra Mohanty, and Gaurav Tomar. 750 GeV resonance in the dark left?right model. *Phys. Lett.*, B756:384–389, 2016.

[27] Kasinath Das, Tianjun Li, S. Nandi, and Santosh Kumar Rai. Diboson excesses in an anomaly free leptophobic left-right model. *Phys. Rev.*, D93(1):016006, 2016.

[28] Harald Fritzsch and Zhi-zhong Xing. Mass and flavor mixing schemes of quarks and leptons. *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.*, 45:1–81, 2000.

[29] Hajime Ishimori, Tatsuo Kobayashi, Hiroshi Ohki, Yusuke Shimizu, Hiroshi Okada, and Morimitsu Tanimoto. Non-Abelian Discrete Symmetries in Particle Physics. *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.*, 183:1–163, 2010.

[30] Hajime Ishimori, Tatsuo Kobayashi, Hiroshi Ohki, Hiroshi Okada, Yusuke Shimizu, and Morimitsu Tanimoto. An introduction to non-Abelian discrete symmetries for particle physicists. *Lect. Notes Phys.*, 858:1–227, 2012.

[31] Stephen F. King and Christoph Luhn. Neutrino Mass and Mixing with Discrete Symmetry. *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, 76:056201, 2013.

[32] Shao-Long Chen, Michele Frigerio, and Ernest Ma. Large neutrino mixing and normal mass hierarchy: A Discrete understanding. *Phys.Rev.*, D70:073008, 2004.

[33] O. Felix, A. Mondragon, M. Mondragon, and E. Peinado. Neutrino masses and mixings in a minimal S(3)-invariant extension of the standard model. *AIP Conf. Proc.*, 917:383–389, 2007.

[34] A. Mondragon, M. Mondragon, and E. Peinado. Lepton masses, mixings and FCNC in a minimal S_3-invariant extension of the Standard Model. *Phys. Rev.*, D76:076003, 2007.

[35] F. Gonzalez Canales and A. Mondragon. The S_3 symmetry: Flavour and texture zeroes. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 287:012015, 2011.

[36] F. Gonzalez Canales, A. Mondragon, U.J. Saldana Salazar, and L. Velasco-Sevilla. S_3 as a unified family theory for quarks and leptons. *arXiv:1210.0288*, 2012.

[37] Jisuke Kubo. Super Flavorsymmetry with Multiple Higgs Doublets. *Fortsch.Phys.*, 61:597–621, 2013.

[38] F. Gonzalez Canales, A. Mondragon, and M. Mondragon. The S_3 Flavour Symmetry: Neutrino Masses and Mixings. *Fortsch.Phys.*, 61:546–570, 2013.

[39] F. Gonzalez Canales and A. Mondragon. The neutrino mixing angle theta(13) in an S(3) flavour symmetric model. *J.Phys.Conf.Ser.*, 387:012008, 2012.

[40] F. Gonzalez Canales and A. Mondragon. The flavour symmetry S(3) and the neutrino mass matrix with two texture zeroes. *J.Phys.Conf.Ser.*, 378:012014, 2012.

[41] F. Gonzlez Canales, A. Mondragn, M. Mondragn, U.J. Saldaa Salazar, and L. Velasco-Sevilla. Fermion mixing in an S_3 model with three Higgs doublets. *J.Phys.Conf.Ser.*, 447:012053, 2013.

[42] F. Gonzlez Canales, A. Mondragn, M. Mondragn, U. J. Saldaa Salazar, and L. Velasco-Sevilla. Quark sector of S3 models: classification and comparison with experimental data. *Phys.Rev.*, D88:096004, 2013.

[43] A. E. Crcamo Hernndez, E. Catao Mur, and R. Martinez. Lepton masses and mixing in $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X$ models with a S_3 flavor symmetry. *Phys. Rev.*, D90(7):073001, 2014.

[44] A. E. Crcamo Hernndez, R. Martinez, and Jorge Nisperuza. S_3 discrete group as a source of the quark mass and mixing pattern in 331 models. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C75(2):72, 2015.

[45] A. E. Crcamo Hernndez, I. de Medeiros Varzielas, and E. Schumacher. Fermion and scalar phenomenology of a two-Higgs-doublet model with S_3. *Phys. Rev.*, D93(1):016003, 2016.

[46] A. E. Crcamo Hernndez, I. de Medeiros Varzielas, and Nicols A. Neill. Novel Randall-Sundrum model with S_3 flavor symmetry. *Phys. Rev.*, D94(3):033011, 2016.

[47] A. E. Crcamo Hernndez. A novel and economical explanation for SM fermion masses and mixings. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C76(9):503, 2016.

[48] Carolina Arbelez, A. E. Crcamo Hernndez, Sergey Kovalenko, and Ivan Schmidt. Radiative Seesaw-type Mechanism of Fermion Masses and Non-trivial Quark Mixing. 2016.

[49] Antonio Enrique Crcamo Hernndez, R. Martinez, and F. Ochoa. Fermion masses and mixings in the 3-3-1 model with right-handed neutrinos based on the S_3 flavor symmetry. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C76(11):634, 2016.

[50] A. E. Crcamo Hernndez, Sergey Kovalenko, and Ivan Schmidt. Radiatively generated hierarchy of lepton and quark masses. 2016.

[51] Dipankar Das and Ujjal Kumar Dey. Analysis of an extended scalar sector with S_3 symmetry. *Phys. Rev.*, D89(9):095025, 2014. [Erratum: Phys. Rev.D91,no.3,039905(2015)].

[52] Dipankar Das, Ujjal Kumar Dey, and Palash B. Pal. S_3 symmetry and the quark mixing matrix. *Phys. Lett.*, B753:315–318, 2016.

[53] Soumita Pramanick and Amitava Raychaudhuri. Neutrino mass model with S_3 symmetry and seesaw interplay. *Phys. Rev.*, D94(11):115028, 2016.

[54] Juan Carlos Gomez-Izquierdo and Abdel Perez-Lorenzana. A left-right symmetric model with $\mu \leftrightarrow \tau$ symmetry. *Phys. Rev.*, D82:033008, 2010.

[55] Werner Rodejohann and Xun-Jie Xu. A left?right symmetric flavor symmetry model. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C76(3):138, 2016.

[56] Rabindra N. Mohapatra and Shumel Nussinov. Bimaximal neutrino mixing and neutrino mass matrix. *Phys.Rev.*, D60:013002, 1999.

[57] C.S. Lam. A $2-3$ symmetry in neutrino oscillations. *Phys.Lett.*, B507:214–218, 2001.

[58] Teruyuki Kitabayashi and Masaki Yasue. $S(2L)$ permutation symmetry for left-handed μ and τ families and neutrino oscillations in an $SU(3)_L \times SU(1)_N$ gauge model. *Phys.Rev.*, D67:015006, 2003.

[59] Walter Grimus and Luis Lavoura. A Discrete symmetry group for maximal atmospheric neutrino mixing. *Phys.Lett.*, B572:189–195, 2003.

[60] Yoshio Koide. Universal texture of quark and lepton mass matrices with an extended flavor $2 <-> 3$ symmetry. *Phys.Rev.*, D69:093001, 2004.

[61] Takeshi Fukuyama and Hiroyuki Nishiura. Mass matrix of Majorana neutrinos. 1997.

[62] Shivani Gupta, Anjan S. Joshipura, and Ketan M. Patel. How good is μ-τ symmetry after results on non-zero θ_{13}? *JHEP*, 09:035, 2013.

[63] Walter Grimus and Luis Lavoura. mu-tau Interchange symmetry and lepton mixing. *Fortsch. Phys.*, 61:535–545, 2013.

[64] Zhi-zhong Xing and Zhen-hua Zhao. A review of ?-? flavor symmetry in neutrino physics. *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, 79(7):076201, 2016.

[65] Shu Luo and Zhi-zhong Xing. Resolving the octant of θ_{23} via radiative $\mu - \tau$ symmetry breaking. *Phys. Rev.*, D90(7):073005, 2014.

[66] Y. H. Ahn. Flavored Peccei-Quinn symmetry. *Phys. Rev.*, D91:056005, 2015.

[67] Diana C. Rivera-Agudelo and Abdel Prez-Lorenzana. Generating θ_{13} from sterile neutrinos in $\mu - \tau$ symmetric models. *Phys. Rev.*, D92(7):073009, 2015.

[68] Zhen-hua Zhao. On the breaking of mu-tau flavor symmetry. In *Conference on New Physics at the Large Hadron Collider Singapore, Singapore, February 29-March 4, 2016*, 2016.

[69] Anirban Biswas, Sandhya Choubey, and Sarif Khan. Neutrino Mass, Dark Matter and Anomalous Magnetic Moment of Muon in a $U(1)_{L_\mu - L_\tau}$ Model. *JHEP*, 09:147, 2016.